

REMARKS

The Office Action dated November 9, 2007 has been carefully considered. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the above claims amendments and following remarks.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §101

In the Office Action, claims 45-46 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to the non-statutory subject matter. Claims 45-46 were deleted. Accordingly, Section 101 claim rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

In the Office Action, claims 1-5, 7-10, 13-29, 32-49 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent Application 2001/0043236 to Yamamoto and other cited references. Applicants respectfully traverse.

First, the Office Action states that the recitation “a method of coding and viewing a two-dimensional CAD drawing” has not been given patentable weight because it occurs in the preamble. The limitation has now been added to the body of the claims.

Second, applicants submit that none of the documents cited in the Office Action are prior art to the present invention as none of them related to encoding a view in a CAD drawing, but instead relate to different subject matter. More specifically, neither Yamamoto nor any other cited reference disclose “encoding a two dimensional drawing” into a “format different from a CAD drawing” as recited in the amended claims.

As previously explained, the passages cited by the Examiner where he states that Yamamoto identified a view merely state that Yamamoto identified selection of a graphical element within a two dimensional drawing and there is no disclosure of identifying a “view” within the two dimensional drawing, as taught by the present application. Yamamoto merely allows selection of a part of a particular view not identification of a view within a drawing. The meaning of the view is clear from the specification as being one of a number of views displayed in two dimensional drawings containing multiple views.

The amended step C now requires that the graphic entity or group of graphic entities which are identified are in the form of a line or curves. There was no disclosure in Yamamoto of identifying lines or curves.

Yamamoto does not extract properties from a 2D CAD drawing, for the reasons set out in applicants’ Response dated August 27, 2007, it instead teaches to extract properties from a 3D drawing in order to generate a 2D drawing. The examiner cited no passage in response to applicants’ argument indicating that this is disclosed in another document.

Additionally, it has been added to the independent claims that the vector properties are derived from coordinates relating to the feature’s position within the drawing. This is not the case for Yamamoto and there is no disclosure to that respect in either Yamamoto or any of the other documents cited in the Office Action.

As the Examiner correctly states Yamamoto does not disclose the feature of generated code bits. Additionally, it does not add generated code bits to a view code, does not store a view code and there is no view code that is “an encoded version of the view in the different format.”

The Examiner states that the feature of “generating code bits” is known from Inoue. This is clearly not the case. The Examiner refers to paragraph 111 line 2-4 and states that the

generation of Mpeg4 bit stream is the same concept as generating code bits. From the definition of code bits given in the description, this is not the case. Additionally, it is now made clear that the code bits must be representation of the extracted vector properties, which, using antecedence, is a direct reference to the vector properties extracted in step B. The Mpeg4 bitstream is clearly not representative of vector properties extracted from a view of step D, in particular because Inoue has no equivalent to step D. Additionally, there is no manner in which Yamamoto and Inoue can be combined such that the properties referred to as being extracted by the Examiner in Yamamoto (paragraph 45, lines 11-14, which are not equivalent to the vector properties extracted in step D of the claim in any case) can in any way be linked to the generating of a Mpeg 4 bitstream in Inoue such that the Mpeg4 bitstream is representative of the properties extracted by Yamamoto in paragraph 45 lines 11-14.

Additionally, Inoue does not include the feature of “adding the generation code bits to a view code for the view”. The examiner states that he takes “adding the IPMP stream to the stream player to objects” as the same concept as this step and that the program code is the same as the view code. Not only is this entirely out of context of the invention, it clearly does not include all the features of claim 1. Claim 1 now includes explicitly the feature that the view code is “an encoded version of the view in a different format”.

Put simply, not only do both Yamamoto and Inoue lack most of the features of the present claims but there is no manner in which the two can be combined which would result in an encoded version of a view from a two dimensional CAD drawing in a different format to a CAD drawing, as recited in the amended claims of the present application.

New Claims

New claims 50-55 do not add new matter and are patentable at least for the reasons set forth above.

Conclusion

In view of the above, the Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance and a favorable disposition to that effect is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding the above amendments, he is kindly invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative at the indicated number.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 9, 2008

/Michael Fainberg/
Michael Fainberg (Reg. No. 50,441)
Thelen Reid Brown Raysman & Steiner LLP
875 Third Avenue
New York, NY 10022
(212) 603-6556
Fax. 212-603-2001
Customer No. 29858